

- AND NOW**, this 25th day of February, ~~2019~~²⁰²⁰, upon consideration of Defendant Raymond Evers' Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 70) and Defendant's Reply in Support (ECF No. 85); Defendant Anthony Boyle's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 72) and Reply in Support (ECF No. 83); Defendant City of Philadelphia's Motion for Summary Judgment (ECF No. 73) and Reply in Support (ECF No. 87); and Plaintiffs' Omnibus Response in Opposition (ECF No. 76) and Omnibus Sur-Reply in Opposition (ECF No. 92), Defendants' motions are **GRANTED IN PART** and **DENIED IN PART** as follows:

Defendant Anthony Boyle's Motion to Dismiss:

1. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Claim:

- a. **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff Bryant. This claim is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
- b. **DENIED** as to Plaintiffs Frazier and Vann.

2. Pennsylvania Whistleblower Claim:

- a. **GRANTED** as to Plaintiff Bryant. This claim is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
- b. **DENIED** as to Plaintiffs Frazier and Vann.

Defendant City of Philadelphia's Motion to Dismiss:

- 1. 42 U.S.C. § 1983 Claim is **GRANTED** as it pertains to all Plaintiffs. These claims are **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

2. Pennsylvania Whistleblower Claim:

- a. **GRANTED** as it pertains to Plaintiff Bryant. This claim is **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.
- b. **DENIED** as it pertains to Plaintiffs Frazier and Vann.

BY THE COURT:



WENDY BEETLESTONE, J.